



Internal Reviews

Performance Period April 2006-June 2006

Introduction

Internal Reviews were successfully implemented in every school complex statewide during fiscal year 2006. This marks the end of the fourth consecutive year of internal implementation of Hawaii's system for examining the performance of local service systems providing services and supports for students with special needs. This report provides data regarding the results of the reviews conducted during the year.

Statewide Findings and Improvements Over Time

Forty-one Complexes conducted Internal Reviews during fiscal year 2006. A total of 605 youth were reviewed using the Coordinated Services Review protocol. Of the total, 32% were attending high school, 22% were in middle school, 41% were in elementary school, and 5% were receiving services through the Early Intervention program. Further, 19% of the sample received services through Family Guidance Centers. A total of 794 Family Guidance Center, school and community members participated in the review during the year.

Review Results for the Fiscal Year

In the fiscal year, thirty-nine of the forty-one complexes (95%) conducting Internal Reviews achieved the desired goal for acceptable system performance. This represents stable findings since last year, when 94% of youth reviewed had acceptable system performance. Similarly, child status was acceptable for 94% of the children reviewed, which compares favorably with last years results of 93% of those reviewed having acceptable child status.

FY 2006 n=605
FY 2005 n=654

Test Outcome 1:	Test Outcome 2:	FY 2006 95% (n=577)	FY 2005 94% (n=615)
+ Child + System Performance	- Child + System Performance		
FY 2006 91% (n=553) FY 2005 89% (n=582)	FY 2006 4% (n=24) FY 2005 5% (n=33)		
Test Outcome 3:	Test Outcome 4:		
+ Child - System Performance	- Child - System Performance		
FY 2006 2% (n=15) FY 2005 4% (n=24)	FY 2006 2% (n=13) FY 2005 2% (n=15)		

FY 2006 94%
(n=568)
FY 2005 93%
(n=606)

Table 1. School Year 2005-2006 Internal Review Results (Fiscal Year 2006)

This year two complexes did not achieve desired system performance: Konawaena (77%) and Hana (67%). Neither had serious overall child status concerns, although there were several specific indicators of child-well-being that need attention in each complex.

This is the second consecutive year Hana has had substantially low system performance. Last year's report of this same time period recommended targeted technical assistance for Hana focused on identifying factors that impact the complex's ability to provide quality services for students. As discussed in the third quarter's report, a third of the youth reviewed in Hana this year were found to have unacceptable system performance results. Core service system issues revolved around inadequacies in identification, address of focal concerns, unity of effort across agencies, service intensity, and transitions. Half of those with unacceptable results received care coordination from the Maui Family Guidance Center, and half from the School-based Behavioral Health program.

It is strongly recommended that the Statewide Interagency Quality Assurance Committee track implementation of needed improvements for both the Konawaena and Hana complexes. Last year for Hana, it was recommended that the Maui District QA Committee monitor implementation of improvements, but this intervention apparently was not adequate in impacting performance of the complex. Monitoring going forward should focus on assuring stronger team practices for strengthening the quality and implementation of individualized plans across dimensions that were found to be weak. Hana would particularly benefit from strengthening of supervision and peer review practices.

Tables 2 and 3 below compare the statewide average scores for each indicator of Child Status and System Performance against the previous two school year's averages. The findings for both child status and system performance at the statewide level are acceptable across all indicators. The data reflect a stable system performing its key functions well. Stability, which was a concern for 22% of youth reviewed last year, has improved statewide, but was still a concern in fourteen of the forty-one complexes, and is low for youth served through the Family Guidance Centers (54% acceptable).

Table 2. School Year 2005-2006 Internal Review Results for Child Status (Fiscal Year 2006)

INDICATORS OF CURRENT CHILD STATUS	STATE AVERAGE SY '03-'04	STATE AVERAGE SY '04-'05	STATE AVERAGE SY '05-'06
Learning Progress	89	90	93
Responsible Behavior	88	87	88
Safety (of the child)	94	94	94
Stability	83	78	85
Physical Well-Being	98	97	98
Emotional Well-Being	92	91	92
Caregiver Functioning	92	91	93
Home Community (LRE)	95	95	93
Satisfaction	93	93	91
OVERALL CHILD STATUS	94	93	92

Table 3. School Year 2005-2006 Internal Review Results for System Performance (Fiscal Year 2006)

INDICATORS OF CURRENT SYSTEM PERFORMANCE	STATE AVERAGE SY '03-'04	STATE AVERAGE SY '04-'05	STATE AVERAGE SY '05-'06
Child/Family Participation	95	95	96
Functioning Service Team	92	94	96
Focal Concerns Identified	90	88	92
Functional Assessments	91	93	95
OVERALL UNDERSTANDING	94	94	97
Focal Concerns Addressed	89	90	95
Long Term Guiding View	87	87	90
Unity of Effort Across Agencies	86	88	92
Individual Design/Good Fit	93	95	95
Contingency Plan (Safety/Health)	92	83	88
OVERALL PLANNING	90	93	94
Resource Availability for Implementation	93	94	97
Timely Implementation	91	92	94
Adequate Service Intensity	90	91	94
Coordination of Services	90	91	93
Caregiver Supports	96	94	97
Urgent Response	94	88	90
OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION	93	93	95
Focal Situation Change	90	91	94
Academic Achievement	87	88	88
Risk Reduction	93	93	92
Successful Transitions	92	93	94
Parent Satisfaction	94	94	93
Problem Solving	87	88	92
OVERALL RESULTS	92	92	94
OVERALL PERFORMANCE	93	94	95

Again, statewide System Performance continued to be strong. Several indicators should be carefully tracked as more than 25% of complexes struggled to meet performance goals in the areas of: Long Term Guiding View; Contingency Planning; Urgent Response; and Academic Achievement.

Specific findings for each complex can be found on the insert on the next page. Specific indicators that did not meet performance goals are highlighted in yellow, and overall Child Status or System Performance findings that were unacceptable for complexes are highlighted in red.

			SY 05-06 INTERNAL REVIEW RESULTS: PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH ACCEPTABLE FINDINGS and STATE AVERAGE																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
DISTRICT	COMPLEX	INDICATORS OF CURRENT CHILD STATUS										INDICATORS OF CURRENT SYSTEM PERFORMANCE																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
		27. Learning Progress	28. Responsible Behavior	29. Safety (of the child)	30. Stability	31. Physical Well-Being	32. Emotional Well-Being	33. Caregiver Functioning	34. Home Community (LRE)	35. Satisfaction	36. OVERALL CHILD STATUS	Understanding the Situation					Planning Services					Implementing Services					Finding What Works					69. OVERALL PERFORMANCE																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
												44. Child/Family Participation	45. Functioning Service Team	46. Focal Concerns Identified	47. Functional Assessments	48. OVERALL UNDERSTANDING	49. Focal Concerns Addressed	50. Long Term Guiding View	51. Unity of Effort Across Agencies	52. Individual Design/Good Fit	53. Contingency Plan (Safety/Health)	54. OVERALL PLANNING	55. Resource Availability for Implementation	56. Timely Implementation	57. Adequate Service Intensity	58. Coordination of Services	59. Caregiver Supports	60. Urgent Response	61. OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION	62. Focal Situation Change	63. Academic Achievement		64. Risk Reduction	65. Successful Transitions	66. Parent Satisfaction	67. Problem Solving																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
KAUAI	KAPA'A (EAST)	100	92	100	92	100	100	100	100	100	98	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Findings for the Fourth Quarter

Two complexes, Kealakehe and Castle, conducted their Internal Reviews during the reporting quarter (April 2006-June 2006). For all 32 of the youth reviewed, the service system was performing at an acceptable level.

For the Castle complex, across indicators of child-well-being, 29 or 91% of the youth were doing acceptably well. Two specific indicators of child well-being were of some concern (Responsible Behavior at 79% acceptable, and Emotional Well-Being at 84% acceptable). Although overall System Performance was rated at 100% acceptable, two specific indicators were of significant concern for half (50%) of the students reviewed: Contingency Planning and Urgent Response. These areas will need focused improvements in order to assure there is adequate planning to address changes in situations and crises.

System performance in the Kealakehe Complex was fairly strong for all youth reviewed. However, Child Status was not acceptable for 17% of the youth, with specific concerns for youth's Responsible Behavior (77% acceptable), Stability (69% acceptable) and Satisfaction (69% acceptable). These areas need to be improved at the level of team planning and service implementation in order to impact these important domains of child well-being. Overall Child Status was acceptable for 83% of those reviewed.

Adequacy of Internal Review Reports

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the reviews, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review of findings and data. The overall goal is to embed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate improvements that are based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty-five school days following the conclusion of the Internal Review unless a specific waiver is granted, and feedback is due back to the complex within another thirty working days. Feedback is given in two main areas: the quality of the review process and the quality of the report and plan. All feedback to Internal Review reports for this quarter have been completed and sent to the complexes.

Description of the Samples

There were a total of 32 students reviewed in the quarter. Table 4 shows the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and Early Intervention.

Table 4. Distribution of the Sample (Fourth Quarter)

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	4th Quarter
Kealakehe	4	4	4	1	13
Castle	6	3	9	1	19
Total	10	7	13	2	32

Further description of the sample is presented in Table 5. Sampling guidelines call for samples to be based on 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504-student population. Of the total number of cases reviewed in the fourth quarter (N=32), 22%

were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Overall, approximately 50% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are receiving case management services by the schools, 22% were IDEA non-Felix students, and 6% were receiving Early Intervention Services.

The State did adhere to the process for establishing the sample for all complexes and every effort was made to include the original youths picked through a random sampling process. In a number of complexes, the selected youth fell off the sample due to having moved out of the complex, or having siblings in the sample, or there were too few CAMHD or Early Intervention youths in the complex.

Table 5. Description of the Sample (Fourth Quarter)

	CAMHD	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA/ Non-SBBH	Early Intervention	4th Quarter
Kealakehe	4	10	4	1	19
Castle	3	6	3	1	13
Total	7	16	7	2	32

Table 6 below displays the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 32 youths reviewed represented the 14 IDEA eligibility categories, 504 Felix students, and children who are categorized as Early Intervention IDEA. The largest percentages of youths were in the categories of Other Health Impairments and Specific Learning Disability (19%). Emotional Disturbance (16%) was the next most frequent.

Table 6. Disability Categories (Fourth Quarter)

	Kealakehe	Castle	Total
Autism	1		1
Deaf/Blindness			0
Deafness	1		1
Developmental Delay	1	1	2
Emotional Disturbance	2	3	5
Hearing Impairment		1	1
Mental Retardation		1	1
Multiple Disabilities	1	1	2
Orthopedic Impairment	1		1
Other Health Impairments	2	4	6
Specific Learning Disability	2	4	6
Speech/Language Impairment		1	1
Traumatic Brain Injury			0
Visual Impairment		1	1
504 Felix	1	1	2
IDEA, Early Intervention	1	1	2
4th Quarter	13	19	32

Participants

A total of 46 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC) and community members, including parents, participated in the Internal Reviews conducted in the reporting quarter. Participation is displayed in Table 7. The participants represented 30 role groups. The largest group was Special Education Teachers (12), followed by DOE Contracted Mentors and Resource Teachers (6), Student Service Coordinators (5), Early Intervention Personnel (4), and School Counselors and Mental Health Care Coordinators (3). There was some duplication in counts for State-level DOE staff, CAMHD Performance Management staff, and Quality Assurance Specialists, who participated in multiple complex reviews.

Table 7. Internal Review Participants (Fourth Quarter)

	Kealakehe	Castle	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)		3	3
Educational Assistant	1		1
Principal			0
Vice Principal			0
Psychological Examiner			0
DOE Contracted Mentors	2	4	6
DOE Contracted: Others			0
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	3	3	6
SBBH Therapist, Manager		2	2
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)		1	1
Special Education Department Chair	1		1
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	5	7	12
Speech Language Pathologist			0
Student Services Coordinator	2	3	5
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition, GT)			0
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)			0
School Assessment Liaison, SAC			0
Librarian, Reading Specialist			0
Autism Consultant			0
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator, DOE Administrator	1		1
Social Worker			0
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member			0
Branch Chief, Clinical Director, Mokihana Director			0
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor			0
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH			0
Family Support Worker, FGC			0
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	2	1	3
Mental Health Supervisor		1	1
Public Health Nurse			0
Early Intervention Personnel	2	2	4
4th Quarter Total Participants	19	27	46

Summary

Based on the scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in the forth quarter and over the year, the state continues to demonstrate that on the whole the majority of youths with special needs continue to do well, and consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. System performance was acceptable for 95% of the 577 students that were reviewed this school year. In the child status domain, 94% were doing well overall. At least two complexes, Hana and Konawaena will need to implement practice and system improvements as well as receive focused technical assistance to assure that services are impacting success for all students.

Complex Data

The following section provides a “profile” of each complex reviewed over the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006 (April 2006-June 2006). Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients: 1) in out of state treatment settings, 2) in out of home treatment, 3) with service delivery gaps, 4) with complaints, and 5) who have current CSPs. Also included are data on the 6) sample size of CSPs that were audited with a CSP quality instrument, and 7) the percentage of those with overall acceptable quality. 8) Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include 1) number of service gaps, 2) percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, 3) number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, 4) number of hearing requests, and 5) percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data on 6) suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

Kealakehe April 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 85% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 15% (n=2)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

85%
(n=11)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	1	41	2%
Out of Home	14	41	34%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	41	0%
Complaints	0	41	0%
CSP Timelines	34	41	83%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2.3	2.3	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	80	0	0	0	66%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	4273	260	525	93	6.08	17.71

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Castle April 2006

Internal Review Results

n=19

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 95% (n=18)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 5% (n=1)	100% (n=19)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**95%
(n=18)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	1	32	3%
Out of Home	5	32	16%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	32	3%
Complaints	0	32	0%
CSP Timelines	28	31	90%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	91	0	0	0	84.3%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	5089	179	758	110	3.52	14.51

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education